

**STATE FOREST LAND  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**Purpose of Checklist:**

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

**Instructions for Applicants:**

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can. Highlighted questions are supplemental to the standard SEPA checklist. These questions look at the proposed project in relationship to the surrounding landscape. Adjacency and landscape/watershed-administrative-unit (WAU) maps for this proposal are available on the DNR internet website at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center." These maps may also be reviewed at the DNR regional office responsible for the proposal. This checklist is to be used for SEPA evaluation of state forest land activities.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later. All of the questions are intended to address the complete proposal as described by your response to question A-11. The proposal acres in question A-11 may cover a larger area than the attached forest practice application acres, or the actual timber sale acres.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

**Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:**

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON PROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer" and "affected geographic area," respectively.

**A. BACKGROUND**

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:  

Timber Sale Name: **Vanilla Bean CH**                      Agreement #: **30-076344**
2. Name of applicant:  

**Washington State Department of Natural Resources**
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:  

**Pacific Cascade Region**  
**P.O. Box 280**  
**Castle Rock, WA 98611**  
  
**Contact Person: Marcus Johns**  
**Phone # (360) 577-2025**
4. Date checklist prepared:  

**April 16, 2004**
05. Agency requesting checklist:  

**Washington State Department of Natural Resources**
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):  

a. Auction Date: **2005**  
b. Planned contract end date (but may be extended): **2006**  
c. Phasing: **N/A**
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.  

**Timber Sale**  
a. Site preparation: **Site prep will ensure that planting can be achieved to acceptable stocking levels that meet Forest Practices rules.**  
  
b. Regeneration Method: **Hand planting and/or natural regeneration.**  
  
c. Vegetation Management: **Treatment will be based on vegetative competition and will ensure a free-to-grow status, which will be in compliance with Forest Practices rules.**

d. Thinning: **As needed to meet desired density, stocking, and growth.**

Roads: **Routine road maintenance, periodic ditch and culvert cleaning as necessary. Construction and reconstruction associated with future forest management activities.**

Rock Pits and/or Sale: **Rock for this proposal and future proposals will be removed from the State’s Five Forks Quarry, State 8 Quarry and/or from Spur 8 (station 15+69 to 17+11). The quarries will be used for future road construction activities associated with forest management operations.**

Other: **Firewood permits for the sale area may be available to the public if, after harvest, downed wood is plentiful near roadsides. Landing debris may be burned upon completion of logging.**

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

- ☐ 303 (d) – listed water body in WAU: ☐temp ☐sediment ☐completed TMDL (total maximum daily load):
- ☐Landscape plan:
- ☒Watershed analysis: **Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis. Available at Pacific Cascade Region office.**
- ☐Interdisciplinary team (ID Team) report:
- ☒Road design plan: **Available at Pacific Cascade Region office.**
- ☒Wildlife report: **Available at Pacific Cascade Region office.**
- ☐Geotechnical report:
- ☐Other specialist report(s):
- ☐Memorandum of understanding (sportsmen’s groups, neighborhood associations, tribes, etc.):
- ☒Rock pit plan: **Available at Pacific Cascade Region office.**
- ☒Other: **Forest Resource Plan, dated July 1992; State Soil Survey; Washington State Department of Natural Resources Habitat Conservation Plan, dated September 1997; ESA listed Salmonid Species Map from Forest Practices, dated 1999. Available at Pacific Cascade Region office.**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

**None known.**

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

- ☒HPA, Blanket Hydraulic Permit Application, Log Number ST-D9199-04 ☐Burning permit ☐Shoreline permit ☒Incidental take permit 1168 and PRT - 812521 ☒FPA # ☐Other:

11. Give brief, complete description of our proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include specific information on project description.)

a. Complete proposal description:

**Approximately 289.5 acres of 57- to 72-year-old timber within nine units were considered for harvest with the Vanilla Bean CH Timber Sale. Of the 289.5 acres, 39 acres were designated as Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) or Wetland Management Zones (WMZs). Within the sale area (247.5 acres) approximately 14 acres of leave trees will be left scattered and clumped within or adjacent to the units, leaving a net harvest area of 233.5 acres. Of the 247.5 acres, 2.5 acres will be harvested as right-of-way to facilitate road construction. There will be 6,945 feet of required road construction; and 3,009 feet of optional road construction. If constructed, 2,608 feet (of the 3,009 feet of optional construction) will be abandoned. This sale is located in the Capitol State Forest off the S-line, S-2000, and the B-6000 road and is approximately 11 miles, by road, northwest of Olympia, WA.**

**The harvest units will be replanted after completion of harvest or the stand will be allowed to naturally regenerate. Riparian Management Zones averaging 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream and 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams have been bounded out of the sale area. A WMZ averaging 180 feet wide will be left along a type A wetland and a WMZ averaging 160 feet wide will be left along another type A wetland. Further forest management activities may be scheduled as shown in question A.7.**

Estimated Volume: **8,643 Mbf.**

Net harvest acres: **233.5 acres**

Rock source/pits/sales: **Rock for this proposal will come from the State’s State 8 Quarry in Section 16, Township 18 North, Range 03 West, W.M.; Five Forks Quarry in Section 22, Township 18 North, Range 04 West, W.M.; and/or from Spur 8 (station 15+69 to station 17+11). The State’s rock quarries will be maintained in a safe condition and may be used for future road projects in the vicinity.**

b. Timber stand description pre-harvest (include major timber species and origin date), type of harvest, overall unit objectives.

**Pre-Harvest Stand Description: Timber types in these units, depending on unit, are dominated by 57- to 72-year-old Douglas-fir, mixed with red alder, western hemlock, noble fir, western redcedar, cherry, grand fir, and bigleaf maple. Sword fern, Oregon grape, vine maple, huckleberry, wild rose, elderberry, blackberry, and salal are also scattered throughout the different units with salmonberry, devil’s club, and skunk cabbage found in the wet areas.**

**Type of Harvest: This proposal involves an even-age regeneration harvest of timber on 247.5 acres. 2.5 acres will be harvested as right-of-way to facilitate road construction. Leave trees will be left individually and in clumps scattered throughout the units. The units will be harvested using shovel equipment on slopes less than 35% and cable systems on slopes exceeding 35%.**

**Overall Unit Objectives: The overall objectives for these forest management units includes the production of sawlogs, poles, and pulp material while managing the stand to provide wildlife habitat by developing vertical stand structure and age class distribution. This may be obtained through the retention of wildlife trees; Riparian Management Zones averaging 160 feet to 180 feet wide, depending on unit, along five type 3 streams; and WMZs averaging 180 feet wide adjacent to a type A**

wetland and 160 feet wide adjacent to a type A wetland. In addition, these stands will be managed in a manner to maintain site productivity, and the integrity and water quality of adjacent streams. Additionally, this proposal is in the visual management area of Capitol Forest. High consideration has been given during harvest design regarding visual concerns of residents in the Summit Lake area, and travelers on State Route 8.

c. Road activity summary. See also attached forest practice application (FPA) for maps and more details.

Type of Activity	How Many	Length (feet) (Estimated)	Acres (Estimated)	Fish Barrier Removals (#)
Construction		9,954	7.0	0
Reconstruction		0		0
Maintenance		0		0
Abandonment		2,608	3.0	0
Bridge Install/Replace	0			0
Culvert Install/Replace (fish)	0			0
Culvert Install/Replace (no fish)	11			

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. (See attached timber sale map. See also color landscape/WAU map on the DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

a. Legal description:

Section 3 Township 18 North, Range 03 West, W.M.  
Section 4 Township 18 North, Range 03 West, W.M.  
Section 5 Township 18 North, Range 03 West, W.M.  
Section 8 Township 18 North, Range 03 West, W.M.  
Section 18 Township 18 North, Range 03 West, W.M.  
Section 24 Township 18 North, Range 04 West, W.M.

b. Distance and direction from nearest town (include road names):

This sale is located in the Capitol State Forest off the S-line, S-2000, and the B-6000 road and is approximately 11 miles, by road, northwest of Olympia, WA.

c. Identify the watershed administrative unit (WAU), the WAU Sub-basin(s), and acres. (See also landscape/WAU map on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “ SEPA Center.”)

WAU Name	WAU Acres	Proposal Acres	Sub-Basin Number
Kennedy CREEK	37,729	126.5	#2
Kennedy CREEK	37,729	38	#5
Kennedy CREEK	37,729	83	#7

13. Discuss any known future activities not associated with this proposal that may result in a cumulative change in the environment when combined with the past and current proposal(s). (See digital ortho-photos for WAU and adjacency maps on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center” for a broader landscape perspective.)

This proposal is located within the Kennedy Creek WAU, sub-basin #2, #5, and #7. Approximately 50% of the Kennedy Creek WAU is managed forestland with the other 50% being residential homes. The residential area is concentrated around Summit Lake. There also appears to be a recent trend towards increasing conversion of forestry lands to home sites in the Steamboat Island area. The uplands are mainly managed for timber production. Ownership includes large industrial forests, small private forests, and DNR managed forests. Forest stands within the WAU appear to be almost exclusively second and third growth stands. The number of Forest Practices shown on the WAU map (referenced above on the DNR website) along with personal observations within the WAU indicates the forests appear to be managed for production of wood products. Management includes timber harvest, recreational activities, and maintaining wildlife habitat and water quality.

The following table is an estimated summary of past and future activity on DNR-managed land and privately managed land in the WAU (information is based off of Forest Practices applications that have been approved in the last seven years compiled by the Department’s GIS database). Proposed future harvests are anticipated on DNR managed land and have not been approved by Forest Practices. No attempt was made to predict future timber harvest on private ownerships within the WAU. Approximately 53% of the land managed by the DNR in the Kennedy Creek WAU is covered with vegetation greater than 25-years-old.

The following table provides recent management activities on DNR managed lands. The source of this information only provided the acreage on the WAU level.

	WAU ACRES	ACRES OF EVEN-AGED HARVEST WITHIN THE LAST SEVEN YEARS	ACRES OF UNEVEN-AGED HARVEST WITHIN THE LAST SEVEN YEARS	PROPOSED ACRES OF EVEN-AGED HARVEST IN THE FUTURE	PROPOSED ACRES OF UNEVEN-AGED HARVEST IN THE FUTURE
KENNEDY CREEK WAU					
DNR MANAGED LAND	9,209	985	1,037	~314	~297
PRIVATE OWNERSHIP	28,519	2,391	722	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
TOTAL	37,729	3,376	1,759	~314	~297

The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #1 is adjacent to the western boundary and is approximately 50 acres in size. The approximate age of the adjacent stand is 14 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #2 is approximately 1500 feet to the southwest and is approximately 60 acres in size. The approximate age of the stand is 14 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #3 is approximately 3000 feet to the west and is approximately 40 acres in size. The approximate age of

the stand is 6 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to unit #4 is approximately 4000 feet to the west and is approximately 40 acres in size. The approximate age of the stand is 6 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #5 is approximately 3000 feet to the south and is approximately 50 acres in size. The approximate age of the stand is 5 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #6 is approximately 3000 to the south and is approximately 50 acres in size. The approximate age of the stand is 5 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #7 is adjacent to the eastern boundary and is approximately 75 acres in size. The approximate age of the adjacent stand is 10 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #8 is adjacent to the eastern boundary and is approximately 35 acres in size. This harvest unit was a partial cut. The approximate age of the adjacent stand is 60 years old. The nearest harvest unit in relation to Unit #9 is approximately 300 feet to the west and is approximately 50 acres in size. The approximate age of the stand is one-year-old. Additional stands within the WAU will be selected for regeneration, thinning, and partial cut harvests in the future as they meet the Departments financial and ecological policies and mandates.

**In addition:** Within the Kennedy Creek WAU in the past three years, DNR has mitigated impacts to water quality, wildlife and fish by the removal of one fish blockage culvert and abandonment of 1.5 miles of stream adjacent road. The previous mentioned activities have had an impact to the public recreational user by changing how the forest is accessed. By abandoning roads that impact streams, the recreational user can now only access the same general areas by walking.

Ongoing assessments of road maintenance needs within the Kennedy Creek WAU are taking place under the HCP and Forest Practices RMAP process.

To reduce the possibility that this proposal may contribute to an increased chance of environmental impact, several mitigation measures will be included in the proposal. Soils exposed during road construction will be seeded with grass and/or straw if it is determined necessary to control erosion. Shovel equipment may be restricted to slopes less than 35% during dry soil conditions. Haul routes for this proposal have also been evaluated for potential impact to the environment. To assure sediment delivery is controlled during the hauling of forest products, multiple cross drains, sediment ponds, and other structures will be used where needed to disconnect ditch water from streams. Ditch water will be routed to the forest floor for filtering prior to entering watercourses. New road construction will be concentrated on stable ridge top locations.

Furthermore, to provide structural diversity for wildlife habitat, maintain fish habitat, and limit possible effects to aesthetic appearances, individual leave trees and leave tree clumps have been identified for retention throughout the proposal. RMZs average 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet along one type 3 stream. A WMZ averaging 180 feet wide will be left along one type A wetland and a WMZ averaging 160 feet wide will be left along a type A wetland. The RMZs and WMZs will help reduce potential sedimentation, provide a source of large woody debris (LWD) to streams and wetlands, maintain shade, reduce the aesthetic impact, and provide habitat for wildlife. A total of 2,226 trees will be retained throughout the proposal to provide structural diversity for wildlife habitat. It should be noted that the trees per acre was determined by using 1/10<sup>th</sup> acre plots. Seven percent of the total number of trees per acre, 12 inches dbh and greater, will be left in each unit.

In addition to mitigation efforts incorporated into this proposal under the HCP and Forest Practices RMAP process, DNR will include contract language in this proposal to meet legal requirements of Forest Practices and Department of Ecology regarding sediment delivery to streams. This language addresses timing of operations, restrictions on impacts to soils (compaction/rutting), and requirements for sediment control devices and techniques.

In February 1995, an analysis of the Kennedy Creek watershed was completed. Prescriptions for harvest within the watershed have been written; however, the DNR has entered into an HCP. The prescriptions within the HCP meet and exceed those from the Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis. The following Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis prescriptions have been met and/or exceeded:

- **Hydrology 3 -** According to the Kennedy Creek Watershed analysis, the landowner will maintain the portion of Kennedy Creek WAU south of State Route 8 in no less than 20% of the intermediate maturity state (10% to 70% crown closures). The DNR policy is to maintain 50% of the DNR managed lands within the WAU as hydrologically mature timber. Approximately 64% of the timber in the Kennedy Creek WAU on DNR managed land is 25-years or older.
- **Surface Erosion 2 –** Harvest prescription #2 has been implemented. According to the Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis, harvest prescription #2 states that a maximum of no more than 50% of the total ground area shall be disturbed. Any disturbance shall be limited to areas no more than 100 square feet of continuous exposed or compacted soil. This pertains to harvest that will occur within 100 feet on slopes greater than 30% of any defined stream channel. For this proposal, no timber will be harvested within 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet along one type 3 stream. Within the proposed sale area, the slopes near the type 5 streams, which exceed 30%, will be either fully suspended or any disturbance shall be limited to areas no more than 100 square feet of continuous exposed or compacted soil.
- **Riparian (LWD recruitment) –** No areas have been identified within the proposal area in the Riparian Resource sensitivity area according to the Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis.
- **Shade 2 (type 2 and 3 waters) –** Four type 3 streams within the proposal area will have 180 foot wide no-cut RMZs and one type 3 stream within the proposal area will have a 160 foot wide no-cut RMZ left as required by the DNR's HCP Riparian Conservation Strategy; therefore, no harvest activity will be within 50 feet of the type 3 streams as required by the Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

**1. Earth**

a. General description of the site (check one):

☐Flat, ☐Rolling, ☐Hilly, ☐Steep Slopes, ☐Mountainous, ☒Other: **The general description varies from flat to steep depending upon the unit.**

1) General description of the WAU or sub-basin(s) (landforms, climate, elevations, and forest vegetation zone).

The Kennedy Creek WAU ranges in elevation from 0 to 2,240 feet. This WAU receives about 50 to 60 inches of precipitation a year. The majority of this precipitation is in the form of rain (99%). Approximately 59% of the slopes in the WAU are under 30%, 32% of the slopes are between 31% and 65%, and 9% of them are over 65%. The primary timber type is Douglas-fir with secondary species including western redcedar, bigleaf maple and western hemlock. This proposal lies within the western hemlock forest vegetation zone.

- 2) Identify any difference between the proposal location and the general description of the WAU or sub-basin(s).

**The vicinity of the proposal matches the general description of the WAU.**

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

**The steepest slope on site is approximately 65%.**

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. Note: The following table is created from state soil survey data. It is a roll-up of general soils information for the soils found in the entire sale area. It is only one of several site assessment tools used in conjunction with actual site inspections for slope stability concerns or erosion potential. It can help indicate potential for shallow, rapid soil movement, but often does not represent deeper soil sub-strata. The actual soils conditions in the sale area may vary considerably based on land-form shapes, presence of erosive situations, and other factors. The state soil survey is a compilation of various surveys with different standards.

State Soil Survey #	Soil Texture	% Slope	Acres	Mass Wasting Potential	Erosion Potential
7216	V.GRAVELLY LOAM	40-65	101	LOW	MEDIUM
1640	V.GRAVELLY LOAM	15-30	44	INSIGNIFICANT	LOW
7213	V.GRAVELLY LOAM	20-40	39	LOW	LOW
6640	SILT LOAM	65-90	29	HIGH	HIGH
1639	V.GRAVELLY LOAM	3-15	11	INSIGNIFICANT	LOW
3837	SILT LOAM	3-15	8	INSIGNIFICANT	LOW
3840	SILT LOAM	30-50	8	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
5689	SILT LOAM	20-40	4	LOW	MEDIUM
2543	V. GRAVELLY SANDY LOAM	3-15	1	INSIGNIFICANT	LOW

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

- 1) Surface indications:

**The slope stability model showed one area of potential high mass wasting within Unit #2. The slope stability model was field checked using a slope stability checklist and no indicators of potential high mass wasting were found. It should also be noted that according to the Kennedy Creek Watershed Analysis all of the units in this proposal are in low hazard units.**

- 2) Is there evidence of natural slope failures in the sub-basin(s)?  
☒No ☐Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

**None known.**

- 3) Are there slope failures in the sub-basin(s) associated with timber harvest activities or roads?  
☒No ☐Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:  
Associated management activity:

**None known.**

- 4) Is the proposed site similar to sites where slope failures have occurred previously in the sub-basin(s)?  
☒No ☐Yes, describe similarities between the conditions and activities on these sites:

- 5) Describe any slope stability protection measures (including sale boundary location, road, and harvest system decisions) incorporated into this proposal.

**Roads will be crowned, ditched, and cross-drained. Soils exposed during road construction will be seeded with grass. Shovel equipment use will be restricted to slopes less than 35%. Lead end suspension shall be required on all cable settings. Most existing roads are located on or near ridge tops.**

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.  
Approx. acreage new roads: **7.0** Approx. acreage new landings: **1** Approx. acreage rock pit fills: **0** Fill source: **Native Material**

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

**Incidental erosion may occur as a result harvest operations and road construction and use; however, prudent road location, construction, and maintenance as well as yarding restrictions will help reduce potential erosion.**

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? Approximate percent of proposal in permanent road running surface (includes gravel roads):

**Approximately 1% of the site will be covered with gravel roads at the completion of harvest.**

- h. Propose measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:  
(Include protection measures for minimizing compaction or rutting.)

**The harvest area is designed to minimize impacts to soil and water. Most existing roads are located on or near ridge tops. Roads will be constructed during dry weather conditions. Storm water runoff will be collected by road ditches and discharged through cross drain culverts onto the forest floor. In addition, culverts will be placed to minimize the amount of ditch water that may flow directly into stream channels. Dissipaters will be placed at culvert outlets to**

reduce sedimentation and control erosion. Grass seed and/or straw bales will be placed on the exposed areas to reduce soil erosion, if it is determined necessary by the Contract Administrator.

Leave tree areas, and the restoration requirements within the 30-foot-wide Equipment Limitation Zone along three type 5 streams will help limit ground disturbance, provide filtration, and maintain stream bank integrity. Lead end suspension will be required on all cable settings. Yarding may be suspended at the discretion of the Contract Administrator when soil rutting exceeds four inches as measured from the natural ground line when there is potential for damage to any public resource. If yarding is suspended, the Contract Administrator must be assured that future harvest operations will not potentially damage any public resource. To reduce potential damage to the earth, the Contract Administrator may require water bars to be constructed by hand and grass seed to be placed on exposed soils. Any and/or all operation(s) of this sale may be temporarily suspended when, in the opinion of the Contract Administrator, there is the possibility of sediment being delivered to any flowing water tributary to any fish bearing stream. The units will be planted within one year upon the completion of logging or allowed to regenerate naturally. Shovel yarding will not be permitted from September 30 to May 1 unless authorized in writing by the Contract Administrator. Riparian Management Zones averaging 180 feet wide will be left along four type 3 streams and a RMZ averaging 160 feet wide will be left adjacent to one type 3 stream to maintain water quality, stream bank integrity, and slope stability. A no-cut WMZ averaging 180 feet wide will be left along one wetland and a no-cut WMZ averaging 160 feet wide will be left along another wetland to minimize ground disturbance in order to maintain hydrologic function.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust from truck traffic, rock mining, crushing or hauling, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Minor amounts of engine exhaust from logging equipment and dust from vehicle traffic and logging equipment will be emitted as a result of this proposal. If landing debris is burned after harvest is completed, minor amounts of wood smoke will be generated. There will be no emissions once the sale is complete.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

If landing debris is burned, it will be in accordance with Washington State’s Smoke Management Plan. A burn permit will be obtained before burning occurs.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. (See attached timber sale map and forest practice base maps.)

- a) Downstream water bodies:

The streams adjacent to Units #1, #2, #8, and #9 are tributary to Kennedy Creek. The stream, which originates within Unit #7, flows into Summit Lake. The wetland adjacent to Unit #9 drains into Schneider Creek, which is tributary to Kennedy Creek.

- b) Complete the following riparian & wetland management zone table:

Wetland, Stream, Lake, Pond, or Saltwater Name (if any)	Water Type	Number (how many?)	Avg RMZ/WMZ Width in Feet (per side for streams)
Stream	3	4	180 (Units #1, #2, #7, & #8)
Stream	3	1	160 (Unit #9)
Stream	5	3	0
Wetland	A	1	180 (Unit #8)
Wetland	A	1	160 (Unit #9)

- c) List RMZ/WMZ protection measures including silvicultural prescriptions, road-related RMZ/WMZ protection measures, and wind buffers.

The widths of the Riparian Management Zone for this proposal were determined by using a 100-year Douglas-fir soil site index curve. The Riparian Management Zones average 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream. WMZs average 180 feet wide along one wetland and 160 feet wide adjacent to one wetland. No wind buffers will be left along RMZs adjacent to the type 3 streams because the streams are less than five feet wide.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) to the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.  
☐No ☒Yes (See RMZ/WMZ table above and attached timber sale map.)  
Description (include culverts):

Timber yarding may take place over one of the type 3 streams and the type 5 stream. Timber falling may occur over or adjacent to one type 5 stream. Cable lines could be suspended over the type 3 and 5 streams. Timber harvest will occur an average of 160 feet from one type 3 stream and a type A wetland and 180 feet from four type 3 streams and a type A wetland.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
- None.**
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. (Include diversions for fish-passage culvert installation.)  
☒No ☐Yes, description:
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.  
☒No ☐Yes, describe location:
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.  
☒No ☐Yes, type and volume:
- 7) Does the sub-basin contain soils or terrain susceptible to surface erosion and/or mass wasting? What is the potential for eroded material to enter surface water?

**The potential for surface and/or mass erosion exists in the headwaters of the sub-basin, typically in headwalls with steep slopes of 30% to 65% or greater and/or where unstable soils are present. A majority of these sites occur near watercourses with deeply incised channels and steep headwall areas. A storm event could result in eroded material entering surface water. The potential for eroded material to enter surface water based on this proposal is low due to erosion control measures that will be included in the proposal. Furthermore, the terrain in the WAU is heavily vegetated and limits the occurrence of soil erosion; therefore, it is unlikely a significant amount of eroded material will enter surface water. In addition, it is unlikely any erodible material will enter flowing waters due to the harvest unit layout, road maintenance, Riparian Management Zones that will be left along five type 3 streams, and WMZs that will be left along two wetlands.**

- 8) Is there evidence of changes to the channels in the WAU and sub-basin(s) due to surface erosion or mass wasting (accelerated aggradations, erosion, decrease in large organic debris (LOD), change in channel dimensions)?  
☒No ☐Yes, describe changes and possible causes.
- 9) Could this proposal affect water quality based on the answers to the questions 1-8 above?  
☐No ☒Yes, explain:

**However, it is unlikely that this proposal will negatively impact stream and water quality. Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) averaging 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream and 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams will maintain stream bank integrity, provide shade, and recruit LWD. WMZs averaging 180 feet wide along one wetland and 160 feet wide along one wetland will help to maintain hydrologic function and natural water flow. The RMZs/WMZs along with items in B.1.h. and B.3.d. will reduce the likelihood that a significant amount of eroded material will enter surface waters mentioned in the proposal. Equipment Limitation Zones averaging 30-feet-wide along the type 5 streams will help limit ground disturbance and maintain stream bank integrity.**

- 10) What are the approximate road miles per square mile in the WAU and sub-basin(s)?

**The Kennedy Creek WAU has approximately 4.4 miles of road per square mile. The numbers of road miles per square mile in the sub-basins are unavailable.**

Are you aware of areas where forest roads or road ditches intercept sub-surface flow and deliver surface water to streams, rather than back to the forest floor?  
☒No ☐Yes, describe:

**In recent years, an emphasis has been placed on using more cross-drain culverts both on new road construction and on existing road reconstruction. This has resulted in more ditch water being discharged to the forest floor.**

- 11) Is the proposal within a significant rain-on-snow (ROS) zone? If not, **STOP HERE** and go to question B-3-a-13 below. Use the WAU or sub-basin(s) for the ROS percentage questions below.  
☒No ☐Yes, approximate percent of WAU in significant ROS zone.  
 Approximate percent of sub-basin(s):
- 12) If the proposal is within the significant ROS zone, what is the approximate percentage of the WAU or sub-basin(s) within the significant ROS zone (all ownerships) that is (are) rated as hydrologically mature?
- 13) Is there evidence of changes to channels associated with peak flows in the WAU or sub-basin(s)?  
☒No ☐Yes, describe observations:
- 14) Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-13 above, describe whether and how this proposal, in combination with other past, current, or reasonably foreseeable proposals in the WAU and sub-basin(s), may contribute to a peak flow impact.

**Based on observations, past, current, or reasonable foreseeable proposals may slightly change the timing/duration/amount of peak flow, and flow rates may increase slightly during low and high flow periods due to decreased transpiration and interception. However, the unit size, location (not in the rain-on-snow zone), Riparian Management Zones, Wetland Management Zones, and Forest Resource Plan green-up policies should limit contributions to peak flow.**

- 15) Is there water resource (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or downslope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in surface water amounts, quality, or movements as a result of this proposal?  
☐No ☒Yes, possible impacts:

**Multiple surface water rights on private land were identified by the Planning and Tracking Special Concerns Report, surrounding the Summit Lake area, Kennedy Creek, Mud Bay, Perry Creek, Eld Inlet,**

Schneider Creek and private wells. The closest stream originates within Unit #7 and flows into Summit Lake. Riparian Management Zones averaging 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream and Equipment Limitation Zones adjacent to the type 5 streams should maintain water quality. WMZs averaging 180 feet wide along one wetland and 160 feet wide along one wetland will help to maintain hydrologic function and natural water flow.

- 16) Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-15 above, note any protection measures addressing possible peak flow/flooding impacts.

The following measures will address peak flow/flooding impacts:

- Increasing the number of culverts resulting in a reduction in the distance between culverts to allow water to be removed from ditches and discharged onto the forest floor.
- Constructing a new road on or as near to a stable ridge top as possible.
- Designating RMZs averaging 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream, WMZs averaging 160 feet wide along one wetland and 180 feet wide one wetland, and Equipment Limitation Zones adjacent to the type 5 streams to maintain bank stability and supply large organic debris.
- Maintaining future harvest unit sizes less than 100 acres and following Forest Resource Plan green-up procedures to help decrease peak flow/flooding.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

**Ground water will not be withdrawn or water will not be discharged into ground water.**

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

**Insignificant amounts of oil and other lubricant could be inadvertently discharged as a result of heavy equipment use. No lubricants will be disposed of on site.**

- 3) Is there a water resource use (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or down slope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in groundwater amounts, timing, or movements as a result this proposal?  
☐No ☒Yes, describe:

**The Planning and Tracking Special Concerns Report, surrounding the Summit Lake area, Kennedy Creek, Mud Bay, Perry Creek, Eld Inlet, Schneider Creek and private wells, identified multiple surface water rights on private land. The closest stream originates within unit 7 and flows into Summit Lake. Groundwater amounts and movement should not be affected by this proposal.**

- a) Note protection measures, if any.

**Riparian Management Zones averaging 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream and Equipment Limitation Zones adjacent to the type 5 streams should maintain water quality. WMZs averaging 180 feet wide along one wetland and 160 feet wide along one wetland will help to maintain hydrologic function and natural water flow.**

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

**Storm water runoff will be collected by road ditches and discharged onto the forest floor. Existing culverts have been placed to minimize the amount of ditch water that may enter into stream channels.**

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

**Some logging slash may enter five type 3 streams and three type 5 streams. Insignificant amounts of oil and other lubricants could be inadvertently discharged as a result of heavy equipment use.**

- a) Note protection measures, if any.

**Slash will be removed by hand from flowing streams at the direction of the Contract Administrator. Equipment use will be limited along streams in accordance with Forest Practices rules. No lubricants will be disposed of on site.**

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:  
(See surface water, ground water, and water runoff sections above, questions B-3-a-1-c, B-3-a-16, B-3-b-3-a, and B-3-c-2-a.)

**Storm water runoff will be collected by road ditches and discharged onto the forest floor. Culverts will be placed to minimize the amount of ditch water that may enter into stream channels. Existing culverts and ditch outs have been installed such that discharge is not concentrated at any location.**

**Trees within the RMZs/WMZs and leave tree areas will lessen the potential for a greater amount of precipitation to directly infiltrate or runoff in addition to intercepting precipitation. Ground disturbance will also be lessened in leave tree areas. Additionally, trees remaining after harvest will continue to evapotranspire.**

See B.1.h.

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:
- ☒deciduous tree: ☒alder, ☒maple, ☐aspen, ☐cottonwood, ☐western larch, ☐birch, ☒other: cherry
- ☒evergreen tree: ☒Douglas-fir, ☒grand fir, ☐Pacific silver fir, ☐ponderosa pine, ☐lodgepole pine,  
☐western hemlock, ☐mountain hemlock, ☐Englemann spruce, ☐Sitka spruce,  
☒red cedar, ☐yellow cedar, ☒other: noble fir
- ☒shrubs: ☒huckleberry, ☒salmonberry, ☒salal, ☒other: Sword fern, wild rose, elderberry, Oregon grape, blackberry, vine maple.
- ☐grass
- ☐pasture
- ☐crop or grain
- ☒wet soil plants: ☐cattail, ☐buttercup, ☐bullrush, ☒skunk cabbage, ☒devil's club, ☐other:
- ☐water plants: ☐water lily, ☐eelgrass, ☐milfoil, ☐other:
- ☐other types of vegetation:
- ☐plant communities of concern:
- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? (See answers to questions A-11-a, A-11-b, B-3-a-1-b and B-3-a-1-c. The following sub-questions merely supplement those answers.)

**All conifer and hardwood trees, except a total of 2226 wildlife leave and green recruitment trees, will be removed as part of this harvest proposal. Understory vegetation will be disturbed and/or reduced within the proposed harvest area as a result of timber felling, bucking, and yarding operations, but most of the vegetation will re-establish after the harvest is completed.**

- 1) Describe the species, age, and structural diversity of the timber types immediately adjacent to the removal area. (See landscape/WAU and adjacency maps on the DNR website at: <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

**Unit #1: To the north, east, and south is a 71-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the west is a 13-year-old stand of Douglas-fir.**

**Unit #2: To the north is a 71-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the east is private property. To the south and west is a 71-year-old stand of Douglas-fir.**

**Unit #3: To the north is a 60-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the east is a 70-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the south is private property. To the west is a 60-year-old stand of Douglas-fir.**

**Unit #4: To the north is a 56-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the east and south is a 70-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the west is a 60-year-old stand of Douglas-fir.**

**Unit #5: To the north is a 56-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the east and south is an 84-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the west is a 70-year-old stand of Douglas-fir.**

**Unit #6: To the north is 30-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the east is a 59-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the south is a 31-year-old stand of Douglas-fir reproduction. To the west is a 56-year-old stand of Douglas-fir**

**Unit #7: To the north is a 63-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the east is a 8-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the south is a 53-year-old stand of Douglas-fir reproduction. To the west is private property.**

**Unit #8: To the north is private property. To the east is a 64-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the south is a 76-year-old stand of Douglas-fir reproduction. To the west is a 63-year-old stand of Douglas-fir**

**Unit #9: To the north is private property. To the east is a 60-year-old stand of Douglas-fir. To the south is a 72-year-old stand of Douglas-fir reproduction. To the west is a 63-year-old RMZ dominated by Douglas-fir**

- 2) Retention tree plan:
- A total of 2226 Douglas-fir, western redcedar, western hemlock, red alder and bigleaf maple will be left for green tree and snag recruitment. The trees per acre were determined by using 1/10<sup>th</sup> acre plots. Seven percent of the total number of trees per acre greater than 12 inches dbh will be left within each unit. A total of 100 trees will be left in Unit #1. A total of 290 trees will be left in Unit #2. The purchaser will select and mark a portion of the total number of trees to be left in Unit #2. A total of 100 trees will be left in Unit #3. The purchaser will select and mark a portion of the total number of trees to be left in Unit #3. A total of 150 trees will be left in Unit #4. A total of 48 trees will be left in Unit #5. A total of 234 trees will be left in Unit #6. The purchaser will select and mark a portion of the total number of trees to be left in Unit #6. A total of 250 trees will be left in Unit #7. The leave trees in Unit #7 will be left along the edges to avoid interference with the B.P.A. power lines. A total of 496 trees will be left in Unit #8. A total of 558 trees will be left in Unit #9. The purchaser will select and mark a portion of the total number of trees to be left in Unit #9. Leave trees will be scattered and left in clumps within and adjacent to the units. Individually scattered trees will be left within the sale area. Wildlife trees were chosen with defects such as split or broken tops, large diameters, and large limbs to increase the potential for wildlife habitat use. Wildlife trees were also chosen in areas to try to protect snags, down logs, and type 5 streams.**

- c. List threatened or endangered plant species known to be on or near the site.
- None known.**
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:
- Some ground vegetation in the sale area will be disturbed during logging. Required leave tree areas and RMZs averaging 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream and 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams, WMZ averaging 180 feet**

wide adjacent to one wetland and 160 feet wide adjacent to one wetland, and equipment limitation zones adjacent to type 5 streams will preserve some of the existing vegetation. Reforestation of the units will occur within one year following harvest or trees will regenerate naturally.

5. Animal

- a. Circle or check any birds, animals, or unique habitats which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: ☐hawk, ☐heron, ☐eagle, ☒songbirds, ☐pigeon, ☒other: pileated woodpecker, purple martin  
mammals: ☒deer, ☒bear, ☐elk, ☐beaver, ☒other: porcupine  
fish: ☐bass, ☒salmon, ☐trout, ☐herring, ☐shellfish, ☒other: tailed frog  
unique habitats: ☐talus slopes, ☐caves, ☐cliffs, ☐oak woodlands, ☐balds, ☐mineral springs

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site (include federal- and state-listed species).

TSU Number	FMU_ID	Common Name	Federal Listing Status	WA State Listing Status
9	42751	CHUM	THREATENED	CANDIDATE

An occurrence of a purple martin is located approximately 1 mile north of the proposal; however, no nest sites have been found. Additionally an occurrence of a pileated woodpecker is located approximately ½ mile east of the proposal; again no nest sites have been found. There also was an occurrence of the tailed frog approximately ½ mile south of the proposal.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.  
☒Pacific flyaway ☐Other migration route: Explain if any boxes checked:

This site is part of the Pacific flyway but is not used extensively for resting or feeding by waterfowl.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

By designing this sale to comply with the State’s HCP, wildlife and wildlife habitat will be provided. Scattered leave trees are favorable to raptor perching, feeding, and nesting. Well-designed and constructed roads should reduce the potential for water quality impacts to downstream fish populations. Grass seeding exposed soils should provide forage. Bounding out potential fish-bearing streams and wetlands from the proposed harvest units will assist to maintain water quality and provide wildlife habitat. Large diameter leave trees will enhance wildlife habitat value of the future stand. Riparian Management Zones, Wetland Management Zones, and equipment limitation zones adjacent to the type 5 streams should protect water quality; provide corridors for wildlife; and maintain habitat for fish, reptiles, and other riparian obligate species. The units are located behind a locked gate, which helps reduce the amount of wildlife disturbance.

- 1) Note existing or proposed protection measures, if any, for the complete proposal described in question A-11.

See B.5.d.

Species /Habitat:	RESIDENT FISH AND CHUM SALMON
Protection Measures:	Riparian Management Zones averaging 180 feet wide along four type 3 streams and 160 feet wide along one type 3 stream will provide habitat for chum salmon and other species.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project’s energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Does not apply.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

Does not apply.

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Minimal hazard incidental to operation of heavy machinery such as the risk of fire or small amounts of oil and other lubricants accidentally discharged as a result of heavy equipment use.

- 1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

There are not any special emergency services required at this time. Pump trucks and/or pump trailers will be required on site during fire season. In the event of a lubricant spill, the Purchaser will contact DNR and the Department of Ecology.

- 2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

**No oil or lubricants will be disposed of on site. The cessation of operations may occur during periods of time when the risk of fire may increase. Fire tools and equipment will be kept on site during fire season. In the event of a lubricant spill, the Purchaser will contact the DNR and the Department of Ecology.**

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
- Does not apply.**
- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from this site.

**Minimal noise levels associated with logging operations and truck traffic. There should be no long-term impacts.**

- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

**None at this time.**

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? (Site includes the complete proposal, e.g. rock pits and access roads.)

**Forest land.**

- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

**No.**

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

**Does not apply.**

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

**Does not apply.**

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

**Forest land.**

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

**Long-term forestry.**

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

**Does not apply.**

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, specify.

**No.**

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

**Does not apply.**

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

**Does not apply.**

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

**Does not apply.**

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

**This proposal has been designed in accordance with the current DNR Forest Resource Plan (July 1992), Final HCP (September 1997), and current Forest Practices rules as they apply in conjunction with current land use classifications.**

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

**Does not apply.**

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- Does not apply.**
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:
- Does not apply.**

## 10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principle exterior building material(s) proposed?

**Does not apply.**

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

**A view of standing mature timber will be changed to a view of an even-aged timber harvest with clumped and scattered individual leave trees and Riparian Management Zones and Wetland Management Zones ranging from 160 to 180 feet wide along the type 3 streams and wetlands in the vicinity of the proposal.**

- 1) Is this proposal visible from a residential area, town, city, developed recreation site, or a scenic vista?  
☐ No ☒ Yes, viewing location:

**Units #6 and #7 are visible from the Summit Lake area.**

- 2) Is this proposal visible from a major transportation or designated scenic corridor (county road, state or interstate highway, US route, river, or Columbia Gorge SMA)?  
☐ No ☒ Yes, scenic corridor name:

**Units #1 and #2 are visible from the State Route 8.**

- 3) How will this proposal affect any views described in 1) or 2) above?

**A view of standing mature timber will be changed to a view of an even-aged timber harvest with clumped and individual leave trees and Riparian Management Zones and Wetland Management Zones ranging from 160 to 180 feet wide along the type 3 streams and wetlands in the vicinity of the proposal. Additionally the unit sizes were kept small and the shapes of each unit were manipulated to help reduce the visual impact.**

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

**A total of 2226 Douglas-fir, western redcedar, western hemlock, red alder and bigleaf maple will be left for green tree and snag recruitment. Leave trees will be left in clumps within and adjacent to the unit. Individually scattered trees will be left within the sale area. Riparian Management Zones Wetland Management Zones ranging from 160 to 180 feet wide along the type 3 streams and wetlands in the vicinity of the proposal will remain following harvest activities. The unit size was kept smaller. The boundaries lines are designed to have an irregular shape and do not follow directly along a visible ridge top. Additionally during the fall of 2003 the DNR attended a Summit Lake Community meeting to inform the residents in regards to this proposal.**

## 11. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

**Does not apply.**

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

**Does not apply.**

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

**Does not apply.**

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

**Does not apply.**

## 12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

**The B-6000 is part of the North Rim #1 trail. Informal recreational opportunities include hunting, berry picking, sightseeing, etc.**

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe:

**Logging of Unit #1 may impact trail riders. Other recreational activities may be temporarily interrupted during periods of operation on the site.**

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

**Reroute the trail while Unit #1 is being logged.**

**13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

**None have been identified.**

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

**None were found or are known to be on site.**

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:  
(Include all meetings or consultations with tribes, archaeologists, anthropologists or other authorities.)

**None at this time.**

**14. Transportation**

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

**Hauling will occur on the S-Line, S-1000, B-line, B-6000, Summit Lake Road, State Route 8, Highway 101, and Interstate 5.**

- 1) Is it likely that this proposal will contribute to an existing safety, noise, dust, maintenance, or other transportation impact problem(s)?

**No.**

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

**No.**

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

**Does not apply.**

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

**See A.11.**

- 1) How does this proposal impact the overall transportation system/circulation in the surrounding area, if at all?

**This proposal should not impact the overall transportation system in the surrounding area.**

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

**No.**

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

**Approximately 10 to 15 log truck trips per day and 2 to 4 administrative trips per week will be generated until the completion of timber harvest. After the project is complete, the number of vehicular trips will return to present levels.**

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

**None.**

**15. Public Services**

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

**No.**

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

**None.**

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.  
  
Does not apply.
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.  
  
Does not apply.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Completed by: Dan Smith Forester 1 Date: April 29, 2004  
Title

Reviewed by: State Lands Assistant Date:   
Title